

STATE OF TEXAS	\$
COUNTIES OF POTTER	\$
AND RANDALL	\$
CITY OF AMARILLO	\$

On the 7th day of November, 2013, the Downtown Design Review Board met in a scheduled session at 5:30 p.m. in Room 306 on the third floor of City Hall, 509 East 7th Avenue, Amarillo, Texas, with the following members present:

VOTING MEMBERS	PRESENT	NO. MEETINGS HELD	NO. MEETINGS ATTENDED
Chan Davidson	No	20	13
Melissa Henderson	No	20	13
David Horsley	Yes	20	17
Charles Lynch	No	20	16
Kevin Nelson	Yes	20	17
Bob Rathbun	Yes	20	15
Wes Reeves	Yes	20	15
Steve Gosselin	Yes	6	6
Howard Smith	Yes	20	20
Dana Williams-Walton	No	20	15

CITY STAFF:  
Kelley Shaw, Planning Director

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE:  
Melissa Dailey, DAI

Chairman Smith opened the meeting, established a quorum, and conducted the consideration of the following items beginning with ITEM 1.

ITEM 1: Approval of Minutes from the June 20, 2013 meeting

Chairman Smith asked if there were any questions or comments regarding the minutes? Mr. Reeves motioned to approve the minutes as presented. Mr. Horsely seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

ITEM 2: Report on Certificates of Appropriateness administratively approved by City Staff

Mr. Smith asked Mr. Shaw to present the item. Mr. Shaw began by stating that this would be a short agenda item as he only had a few projects to report on. Mr. Shaw reported that there were four projects requiring Certificates of Appropriateness (COA) since the last update. All four were administratively reviewed and approved. Projects included a side yard patio cover viewable from the right-of-way, a residence replacing the roof and rain gutters, an accessory building, and a temporary event sign (flu shots). Mr. Nelson asked how the business owner came to know he needed to get a COA for the temporary sign. Mr. Shaw said that a sign permit was needed and building safety had referred him to the Planning Department for the COA.

ITEM 3: Discuss amendments related to elements within the Downtown Amarillo Urban Design Standards and the related development review process

Mr. Shaw gave a brief summary of where the proposed amendments stood at this point in time. Mr. Shaw reminded the Board that all the substantive changes recommended by the Amendment Subcommittee, stemmed from issues or comments that came up during the review of actual projects that came before the Board. One of the main amendments recommended came from the Polk Street United Methodist Church "addition" project. A majority of Board members thought that with such a significant addition, walkway improvements (lights and trees) should be triggered.

Mr. Shaw stated that the recommended amendments had also been presented to the Downtown Amarillo Inc. (DAI) Board of Directors. With one exception, the initial comments from the DAI Board were positive regarding the proposed amendments. Mr. Shaw stated that one DAI Board member expressed several concerns and said that there were other downtown property owners who had similar concerns. The DAI Board suggested City Staff meet with these property owners to hear those concerns before proceeding further with any changes.

Mr. Shaw stated that he and four other Downtown Design Review Board (DDRB) members, as well as Melissa Dailey, DAI Executive Director, and the DAI Board Chairman met with five concerned property owners as the DAI Board had suggested. Mr. Shaw stated that, in his opinion, the majority of the concerns had to do with a misunderstanding of what and when Downtown Urban Design Standards applied. Mr. Shaw went over a list of concerns that were discussed at the meeting which included the Downtown Amarillo Urban Design Standards (DAUDS) were too restrictive, too much attention was being given to pedestrians and that traffic and circulation was more important, the boundaries of the DAUDS District were too big, and that the composition of the DDRB should be changed to include more property/business owners.

The other DDRB members present at the meeting then addressed the DDRB regarding their opinion of the concerns. Mr. Nelson stated he also believed many of the concerns were more of a general nature. He said his immediate takeaway was that there does need to be something done to clarify how the design standards apply. On a longer timeframe, Mr. Nelson said he believed there could be some discussion as to looking into the boundaries and perhaps look at the merits of having different standards for different areas. Mr. Nelson also suggested that the DDRB might want to consider possible options/alternatives for required streetscape improvements that still meet the design's standard's intent. Mr. Smith agreed that there needs to be better communication related to how the design standards are applied but felt the changes being looked at were not big, impactful changes.

The comments from the DDRB then centered on what could be done to eliminate any misunderstandings or better clarify aspects of the design standards. Mr. Reeves suggested that since the DAUDS were approved in 2010 that actions could be taken to make the standards a new story and to keep educating the public on what they are all about. Mr. Hoarsley suggested that having a stronger web presence with informational services related to the design standards could help. Mr. Rathburn suggested the DDRB members take an active role in speaking with downtown property/business owners to help in understanding the DAUDS.

Mr. Shaw then discussed with the DDRB actions that could help clarify the DAUDS which included revisiting the language and formatting in the Development Review Process and Walkway Corridor sections of the DAUDS as well as implement an ongoing educational/promotional program related to the DAUDS. Mr. Shaw then asked if Board members were comfortable, he would work on the suggestions given and schedule the amendments for consideration at the Boards December meeting. Mr. Smith asked Mr. Shaw to move ahead as stated.

Mr. Smith asked if Melissa Dailey had any comments. Mrs. Dailey stated that everything was summarized correctly but she wanted to make sure that the DDRB understands that the comments from the concerned individuals were not representative of the DAI Board. Mr. Shaw then described the remaining approval process should the Board formally recommend the amendments which included presentations and recommendations from the Comprehensive Plan Advisory Committee, the Planning and Zoning Commission with final action from the City Commission. The Board then recommended Mr. Shaw move forward with the amendments taking into account the suggestions previously mentioned.

ITEM 4: Public Forum

No one spoke

ITEM 5: Consider Future Agenda Items

Mr. Shaw stated that unless there was a need to meet, there were no plans to reschedule the Board's regularly scheduled meeting which would fall on July 4<sup>th</sup>.

---

Kelley Shaw  
Planning Director